



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/031,138

05/02/2002

Miyawaki Hiroshi

967 022

8211

20874

7590

10/16/2009

MARJAMA MULDOON BLASIAK & SULLIVAN LLP
250 SOUTH CLINTON STREET
SUITE 300
SYRACUSE, NY 13202

EXAMINER

CHEUNG, MARY DA ZHI WANG

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3694

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/16/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****U.S. Patent and Trademark Office**

Address : COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
10031138	5/2/02	HIROSHI, MIYAWAKI	967 022

MARJAMA MULDOON BLASIAK & SULLIVAN LLP
250 SOUTH CLINTON STREET
SUITE 300
SYRACUSE, NY 13202

EXAMINER

MARY CHEUNG

ART UNIT	PAPER
----------	-------

3694	20091013
------	----------

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

The comments for allowance filed on 10/1/09 has been considered. The applicant stated the language of the statement for the Reasons for Allowance by the examiner is not identical to the language of the claim. For the independent claims 1-2 and 24-25, the claims contain the same concept for allowance although the claim language is not identical. The examiner wrote the reason for allowance based on the concept of the claims, not direct citations from the claim language; therefore, quotation marks are not used by the examiner. For the independent claim 23, it contains different concept for allowance; thus a separate reason for allowance was stated. In conclusion, it is believed all independent claims are properly stated for reasons for allowance.

/Mary Cheung/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3694